LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH — R.P.D.

THE CRISIS IN GERMANY — A German Anti-Fascist

"BRITAIN FOR THE PEOPLE" — G. D. H. Cole

DANGER SIGNALS IN INDIAN ECONOMY — S. A. Dange

THE LIBERATION OF POLAND — Quæstor

COMMUNISM AND ITALIAN UNITY — Palmiro Togliatti

CHINA'S DESTINY — Chen Pai-Ta

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CRISIS IN GERMANY

6D

SEPTEMBER 1944

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVI. No. 9

CONTENTS

September, 1944

Page

Notes of the Month—*Foundations of the Future* by R. P. D. 257

The Crisis in Germany by a GERMAN ANTI-FASCIST 264

"Britain for the People" by G. D. H. COLE 268

Danger Signals in Indian Economy by S. A. DANGE 269

The Liberation of Poland by QUAESTOR 273

Communism and Italian Unity by PALMIRO TOGLIATTI.... 276

China's Destiny by CHEN PAI-TA 278

Book Reviews—

Debate on Africa by LEONARD BARNES 285

Planning for India by R.P.D. 286

Correspondence 287

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in August, 1944 : £82 : 5 : 6

"A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR"

These words have appeared on the cover of LABOUR MONTHLY ever since it was first published in 1921. Now, twenty-three years later, let us see what our readers, both at home and abroad, say about the L.M.

Palestine: "Though not an Englishman, I am very interested, as a worker myself, in the struggles and problems of the British working-class. In my opinion, the LABOUR MONTHLY reflects it from the right point of view."

Canada: "Please put the balance in the Fund as a small tribute to your periodical, for it has answered many pertinent and vital questions which we Canadians ask."

Two Readers at Home: "Well, as far as I am, or am becoming, 'highly politically conscious,' I owe it to the L.M."

"It is a pleasant duty to forward my August contribution to the Fund in appreciation of benefits past and to come. I am sure all readers of the L.M. will agree 'We could not do without it,' but I am certain too many do not realise the necessity for adequate funds to maintain its publication and high standard. If every reader doubled the purchase price I imagine the Fund would stand at round about £200 a month—and a bob a month, in my opinion, is a paltry price to pay for the L.M. and its guidance."

WE NEED £100 PER MONTH. CAN WE GET IT ?

WE COULD IF EVERY READER WOULD SEND JUST SIXPENCE A MONTH.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
R. Morris		10	0	F. Birchenough ...	1	0	0	G. Sargent		5	0
S. Morrissy		12	0	R. de Lambert ...		3	0	E. Belsey		2	6
R.E.M.E.		10	0	D. Gardner ...		2	0	Two Canadian Radar Mechs.		6	0
J. Roeback		12	0	J. B.		5	0				
Gosport D.G. ...		8	0	H. Tomalin ...	6	0	0	F. Brand		1	6
Radio Mech.,R.E.M.E.		3	0	A. Neville ...		2	0	Russophile		5	0

(*Continued on page iii. of cover*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Foundations of the Future—Prospects of Victory—United Nations Policy—Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods—A Record of Progress—Critics and Opponents—Future of Germany—Acid Test of Anti-Fascism—False Analogies with 1918—Rip Van Winkles—Versailles and Hitler—Nazi Myths Exposed—New World Situation—No Repetition of Old Mistakes—Unity of the West and the Soviet Union—Lessons of the Past—Germany Today and Tomorrow—Critical First Phase—Key to the Future.

WE are approaching the great issues of the final phase of the war in Europe. With widening sweep the present offensive battles of the liberation armies, from France to Poland, and from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, are preparing the way for the last stage when the avenging armies of the peoples will close in on Nazi Germany for the final destruction of Nazi power on the soil that bred it. As the outer walls of the Nazi prison-house began to fall, the peoples of Europe are springing to new life. No longer only from the East, but from the West, and from the South, the war of movement advances. The speed and scope of the grand combined offensive, from East, South and West, show that the military plans of Teheran were well and truly laid. The further outcome, which begins to draw into view, will show that the political plans of Teheran for the future settlement of the peace of the world have been no less well and truly laid. It will be for all the peoples of the United Nations to see that these plans are no less completely executed. Despite all the pleas and sophistries of its advocates and defenders, Fascism shall not escape. The approaching victory of the United Nations is bringing new world relations of power, and new world conditions, basically different from those of 1918-1941; and only those who remain buried in the past fail to see the new that is arising and that is now within our grasp.

THE magnitude of the military successes already won on every front, within ten weeks of the opening of the combined offensive, as well as the signs of weakening of the German armies, and of the beginnings of internal crisis within the German ruling regime, have aroused widespread hopes of victory in the near future. Such possibilities are not excluded, given an extreme acceleration of the tendencies to inner weakening in the German armies. In Mr. Churchill's sober phrase of July 23, "it might be that the fighting might come to an end earlier than we have the right to say." But the hopes of the closer approach of victory in the coming months cannot exclude the recognition that the fiercest and most desperate fighting, and the most reckless measures of every type from the Nazi enemy, may characterise the final phase of the war in Europe, with destruction on a scale still little imagined. The Nazis have still very considerable forces and resources, which they will use to the utmost, the more desperate their situation. By the recent crisis, whatever its longer term weakening effects, they have temporarily intensified their grip on the army and the German people; and they intend to use their control, as indicated in their recent speeches, to continue the fight without surrender, not only to the point of defeat, but beyond defeat. The military and political factors are more closely intertwined

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than ever in these final stages of the war, requiring the utmost strength, unity, firmness and determination of the Allies in both fields to ensure victory and allow no escape for the enemy. Hence the confidence of the closer approach of victory makes the more necessary the united resolution and preparedness, not only of the Allied Governments, but of public opinion, for all the measures which will be essential to win victory, to carry victory to completion and to ensure that the aims of the war against fascist aggression shall be fulfilled.

DESPITE the pessimism and alarms of the critics in certain quarters, who appear to think that the Allied Governments either have no policy in relation to the settlement at the end of the war, or have the wrong policy, in fact, very considerable progress has been made to carry forward the decisions of Teheran to meet the new issues. Indeed, it might rather be said that official Allied policy is markedly ahead of the critics, and of many of the organs of press opinion, in facing the new problems, at a time when the critics are still content to read sapient lectures on the basis of the antiquities of 1918, which have very little bearing on the present essentially different situation, and which, in any case, so far as they have a bearing, teach a very different lesson from the fantastic myth originally created by Nazi propaganda and now repeated by these advocates.

IT is evident that a very considerable measure of unity has been reached on the key question of the settlement in relation to Germany, carrying forward the decisions already published from the Moscow Conference. The opening of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference indicates the progress that has been made towards agreement on the practical forms and methods to carry out the Moscow and Teheran decisions for the organisation of world security, with the decisive leadership and responsibility of the four main Powers, those carrying the brunt of the present struggle, and with the equal and sovereign participation of all democratic nations in a broad international organisation. The unanimous agreement of the governmental delegates of forty-four nations at Bretton Woods, despite the preceding sharp controversies, and although still requiring ratification, represents a first step towards establishing common ground for the post-war tasks of international economic collaboration.

IN relation to individual countries, there is also a record of advance. In Italy there is now established in the capital a strengthened democratic Government, which is able to exercise an extending authority with the agreement of the Allied military command, and has initiated measures to purge out the Fascist plague. The outcome of Mr. Churchill's visit to Italy, and of his meetings with Marshal Tito, has still to be reported. The French Provisional Government, strengthened by the participation of the French armies north and south, and by the high achievement of the French Forces of the Interior, is already achieving recognition in practice, even if not yet in form, and can now look forward to the return in the near future to the capital, freed from the filth of the Deats, Petains, Lavals and Nazi gangsters. In Poland the basis is established for a strong, independent and democratic Poland, which no intrigues of reactionary emigres, masquerading under the pretence of "legality" of a fascist constitution, will be able to overthrow.

THERE are still negative sides to the picture: in India; the fawning on Franco; the protection of Nazism in the prisoner-of-war camps in Britain and America, in such marked contrast to the brilliant successes of the anti-fascist work among the Ger-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man prisoners of war in the Soviet Union. These are symptoms of the old pre-Teheran policies still persisting. But the general tide of advance is unmistakable, however much the pace in particular aspects may cause some justifiable impatience.

AT the same time, we cannot lose from sight the strength of the opposing forces which are still active, and even increase their activity, as they see the approaching doom of fascism, and the bonds of the Teheran alliance for war and for peace growing stronger instead of weaker. When the presidential candidate, Governor Dewey, on behalf of the Republicans, lodged a protest "in the interests of small nations" against the Four-Power world security proposals, that was an important danger-signal of the fight in front. Similarly, the persistent sniping at the Bretton Woods agreement, on the part of powerful financial interests, isolationist politicians and certain influential journals, both in Britain and the United States (instanced in the *New York Times* broadside attack, and in the *Economist's* acid recommendation "neither to accept nor to reject"), reveals the strength of opposition of reactionary monopolist interests against such a policy of compromise agreement and co-operation. More open are the intrigues and poisonous propaganda emanating from Vatican sources and all those sections which have chosen to make Polish Junkerdom and reaction their banner for anti-Soviet, anti-Teheran and pro-fascist incitement.

BUT the height of the anti-Teheran reaction has revealed itself over the issue of Germany and the future of Germany. Here the Munichite M.P's, the friends of Mosley and the old devotees of Nuremburg, the Catholic intriguers and the Peace Pledge Union, the *Economist* and the *Tribune* and writers on the *New Statesman*, Mr. Brailsford and Mr. Bernard Shaw and Professor Laski and Professor Joad have all joined hands to denounce the policy of the Government and of the United Nations. Already, with the Nazi armies still not yet broken, with the Nazi terror machine still claiming its daily thousands of victims, these apostles of clemency and statesmanlike moderation, looking well ahead, have begun to transfer their solicitude to anxiety lest the patriots of the tortured countries of Europe should deal harshly with the accomplices and collaborators of Nazi terror, and to concern to ensure that Germany shall emerge from the war unweakened.

THE recent signs of the beginning of crisis in the ruling ranks in Germany, alongside and reflecting the speed of military events, intensify the urgency of this question. It is obvious that the immediate settlement in relation to Germany, and the execution of effective measures to break the power of fascism and military reaction in Germany, is the first practical issue facing the democratic alliance in the hour of victory; the foundation of all future world settlement; and the acid test of serious anti-fascism today. The solution of this problem, as in every step in the fight against such a ruthless and cunning enemy as fascism, can only be based on a correct and objective estimate of real forces, and not on liberal-pacifist hypotheses and imaginations.

MUCH of the outlook of those liberal, democratic and pacifist sections who criticise the harshness of the proposed United Nations measures in relation to Germany (unconditional surrender; military occupation; disarmament; punishment of war criminals; reparations; certain territorial changes; and probably economic control of heavy industry), and see in them the seeds of future war, is based on false analogies with 1918 and memories of the last war and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its outcome. It used to be said in the last war — libellously enough — that British brasshats approached it with memories of the South African War, just as the French General Staff approached the present war with memories of the positional warfare of 1914-18. Certain it is that many representatives of the labour and democratic movement are crippling their understanding of the present new world situation because they endeavour to see it through the spectacles of a situation of a quarter of a century ago.

BUT history never repeats itself save to the dull-sighted. These dwellers among the ghosts of the past lose completely from their view the two main factors of the past quarter of a century, which had no existence in 1914: first, the growth of the Soviet Union to a foremost world power; and second, the development of fascism. Yet these are the two main pivots of the modern period of world history; and the war between these two forces for the future of the world, between the rising forces represented by the Soviet Union, socialism and the free peoples of the world, and the declining forces, represented by fascism, is the central theme of the present war, just as the Anglo-German rivalry was the central theme of the last war: it is only in the outward trappings that the superficial parallels appear.

THE line of argument of these Rip Van Winkles is familiar. The Versailles Treaty, they declare, represented the attempt to disarm and hold down Germany and impose penal provisions. The outcome, they declare, was to exacerbate the German people and led to the domination of Hitler. The Versailles Treaty proved impotent, and within a quarter of a century the defeated Germany was more strongly armed than ever and able to embark on a new thrust for world domination on a still greater scale.

We cannot break the power of sixty million German-speaking people to organise and maintain their military resources. We tried in 1919 and failed. The attempt produced Hitler and a renewal of the war.

—(G. Bernard Shaw in the *Sunday Pictorial*, August 13, 1944.)

Attempts made to hold down vigorous nations over an indefinite period by force of arms have always failed. . . . The German navy was sunk to the bottom of the sea; the German army reduced to 100,000 men and so on; until the German people, exasperated by the slights and humiliations that we put upon them, were within a decade turning a receptive ear to the savage sophistries of Hitler with results that are all too visibly before us.

—(C. E. M. Joad in the *New Statesman and Nation*, August 19, 1944.)

Hence the conclusion is drawn that the part of wise and far-seeing statesmanship after the defeat of Nazi Germany is to draw up a magnanimous treaty for Germany, without penal terms of discrimination, lest the German people turn to a new Hitler.

EVERY step in this argument is false, either in direct historical fact, or by omission of the decisive factors underlying the development recorded. It is not true that the Versailles Treaty carried through the effective disarmament of Germany; on the contrary, the Allied Powers winked at the secret rearmament of Germany, the formation of illegal armed corps, the maintenance of stores of arms and the violation of the disarmament clauses from the outset (and reports of the Inter-Allied Disarmament Commission exposing the facts were shelved and hushed up), because their fear of Bolshevism and hostility to the Soviet Union was greater than their antagonism to German imperialism. This was the decisive factor which corroded the disarment clauses of the Versailles Treaty, and not any ponderous absolute historical law about the impossibility of disarming

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a defeated nation, Germany was able to rearm completely, and on a yet more powerful scale, not because the Versailles Powers were incapable of preventing it, but because they deliberately permitted, encouraged, assisted and even financed German rearmament, as a weapon against the Soviet Union. The German military revival and renewed aggression within two decades of complete defeat took place on the very definite basis of the antagonism and division of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union. This was the key governing force of the period between the two wars, which is left out of account in the liberal-pacifist legend. And this is the fundamental fact which has now changed, by the consolidation of the United Nations alliance and the Teheran agreement; and this change opens the way to a new development, rendering the old arguments out of date.

SIMILARLY it is not true that Hitler came to power in Germany because of the Versailles Treaty. This is the Nazi myth. German Fascism stems directly from the illegal armed formations which were permitted by the Versailles Powers as a bulwark against Bolshevism. If the resentment of the German people against the penal impositions of the Versailles Treaty had swept Hitler to power, Hitler should have been swept to power in the nineteen-twenties when the memories of the Poincare period and of the Ruhr occupation were still fresh. On the contrary, the Nazi vote sunk to infinitesimal proportions during the nineteen-twenties. It was from 1930 onwards, that is, from the world economic crisis, mass unemployment and disillusionment with the failure of leadership of German Social Democracy, that Nazism began to sweep forward with mass support. Nazism used the Versailles Treaty as an instrument of propaganda. But Nazism rose to power on the basis of the internal class contradictions in Germany, of the military and reactionary forces left untouched by the uncompleted democratic revolution of 1918, and by the support and assistance of powerful reactionary forces in Anglo-French-American high finance and diplomacy.

THUS the pseudo-historical argument of the liberal-pacifist opponents of Teheran equally leaves out of account the main lessons of the past period and the fundamental new facts of the present situation. The division between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, the anti-Soviet and anti-Bolshevik blindness and frenzy of Western reaction, wrecked the settlement at the end of the last war, permitted the revival of German military power, destroyed the League of Nations and collective security, and made the second world war inevitable. If this division were to be permitted to be revived at the end of the present war, then a similar outcome, or an even more destructive outcome in the character of the resulting third world war, would become finally inevitable. But it is in our power to prevent this outcome. The path of the Teheran and Moscow Agreements, of Dumbarton Oaks, of Four Power unity leading the democratic nations of the world, places in the hands of the peoples the possibility to turn history along a different course, a course that will destroy fascism, maintain peace and protect the democratic development of the nations during the present period of transition to a new order of society.

WILL the peoples of the West, of Britain, France and America, respond to this opportunity, and maintain the alliance, not only for the immediate aim of military victory over Nazi Germany, but for the enforcement of a peace that will prevent new German aggression and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organise the future of world co-operation? The *Economist* is confident that they will not, if the agreed United Nations lines of settlement for Germany are adopted. The *Economist* editorial denounces the proposed terms on the supposed "practical" grounds that the Western nations will not maintain them a generation hence, if need arises and if the same issue of the revival of the fascist and military menace should recur:

> Allied opinion in the West will not be willing, when the time comes, to lift a finger to enforce the kind of settlement, particularly the kind of territorial settlement that is now proposed. (*Economist*, 12/8/44.)

WHENCE comes this divinely inspired foreknowledge of the *Economist*, not only of the world situation a generation hence, but of the minds of a generation still unborn or still in the schoolroom? Once again, as the rest of the article makes clear, by a simple and naive transposition of the facts of the past period into the future. The "proof" is based on the experience of the nineteen-thirties. In other words, it is based on the assumption that the same conditions of the nineteen-thirties will recur, the same type of situation in the European countries and the world, not only the same anti-Bolshevik and anti-Soviet hostility, the same development of fascism, the same division of the democracies, but the same penetration of the Fifth Column and domination of Munichism or Isolationism in the Western countries. But apart from the fact that the general world situation will be likely to follow very different lines, if the path of Teheran is followed, including the situation in Germany, it is also the case that the peoples of the West can learn from experience and never again allow the domination of the forces represented by Munichism.

INDEED, it is not true even of the nineteen-thirties, it is a slander on popular sentiment and expression of that time, to say that the peoples then were lethargic and unwilling to resist the aggression of fascism. Spain proves the contrary. The amazing unofficial referendum in Britain, in which six millions voted for armed resistance to aggression, proves the contrary. The eighty per cent. polls, according to the current newspaper tests of public opinion, for an Anglo-Soviet Treaty, at a time when the Government was still resisting it, prove the contrary. It was the dominant reactionary sections of the ruling class in the West which sold the pass, tore up Versailles and the League, and gave free play to fascism and aggression, and had to lie and deceive public opinion in order to carry out this policy. But since then a whole epoch of experience has taken place. Even within the ruling class there are changes; the policy of a Churchill—the Ishmaelite of the nineteen-thirties—is not the policy of a Chamberlain. How much more then, will the peoples of Britain and France and America have reason, after the experience of the second world war, after the blood-stained lessons of Nazi barbarism, and after the comradeship of the United Nations alliance, to stand firm, and to see that they have Governments which stand firm, for the maintenance of the alliance, for friendship with the Soviet Union, and for the future of democratic world co-operation, including whatever terms are necessary to prevent the revival of the menace of German fascism and militarism.

THE final solution of the future of Germany, the final eradication of the roots of fascism and militarism and reaction in Germany, will not be accomplished by the external coercive measures which will be necessary in the first period after the war to prevent the revival of these forces, while

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the working-class and popular forces are still weak. The final solution will require a social transformation which can only be carried out, and will ultimately be carried out by the German working-class and the German people. But it is in the immediate period (whether over a few years, a decade or two decades) after the defeat of Nazi Germany, during which the still numerous Nazi, military and reactionary sections, far more powerfully organised than after 1918, will use every method of terrorism and sabotage and manoeuvre and playing on divisions between the Allies, to win back leadership, while the working-class and democratic forces will still be suffering from the weakness and disorganisation consequent on eleven years of Nazi suppression, extermination of scores of thousands of militants and indoctrination of the younger generation: it is during this period that the danger lies.

IT is during this period that the measures agreed by the United Nations will be essential to disarm Germany; to rout out and destroy the Nazi gangs and mete out stern justice to the criminal Nazi and militarist leaders and gangsters; to exact reparation from the German people for the work of destruction done in Europe; and to bar the way to German economic and political domination in Western and Central Europe. These measures will be equally necessary for the protection of the freedom of the European peoples and the peace of the world—the decisive first consideration—and also for the future of German democracy. These measures will need to be accompanied by the fullest scope for the development and strengthening of German working-class organisation and free democratic institutions within the conditions laid down by the peace settlement, preparing the way for the deeper changes within Germany which will lead to the final solution. For it is German anti-fascism, however weak at present, that is the kernel from which must develop from within, under the hammer of experience, that so-called "re-education" of the German people, about which so many blimps and reactionaries are fond of talking today, who could do with some re-education themselves. But this inner development in Germany must go hand in hand with full acceptance of the just measures which the United Nations will impose.

THE key to the immediate future, equally for the settlement with Germany and for the durability of that settlement, and for the wider aims of world peace and world co-operation, lies through the firm partnership of the Four Powers, Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union and China, leading the world association of democratic nations. This is the fundamental new feature which reverses the entire experience of the inter-war period. This is the basic principle which is now being carried forward to concrete shape and form and practical machinery through the consultations at Dumbarton Oaks. And it is not without significance that the reactionary isolationist elements which have sought to use Dewey as their spokesman should have fastened on precisely this Four-Power principle of leadership for their attack. For it is here that arises the difference from the weaknesses of the pre-war League of Nations, with its sectional basis, its initial exclusion of the Soviet Union and separation from the United States. For the first time arises the possibility of effective world concentration of power in the hands of the democratic peoples, ending the divisions and antagonism of the Western nations and the Soviet Union which wrecked the inter-war period, and thereby opening the way to durable world co-operation for the maintenance of peace and for democratic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progress. This is the perspective and aim for which we must fight against all the new would-be wreckers today. And this is the perspective within which we shall also be able to approach and solve the problems of the immediate future for Britain, to which it will be necessary to return in a subsequent issue.

R. P. D.

August 22, 1944.

The Crisis in Germany

by a GERMAN ANTI-FASCIST

THE disastrous defeats, since the beginning of June, of the German armies on the Eastern front, in Normandy and in Italy, have led to a quick sharpening and finally to an open outbreak of the internal political crisis of the Hitler régime.

In the middle of July, a group of leading generals and officers, among them one field-marshal, attempted (so the Nazis allege) to kill Hitler and to seize power in Germany. The conspirators include (*a*) active officers of the General Staff and of the Command of the Home Army like General Olbricht and Count von Stauffenberg; (*b*) active officers on the eastern front like General of the Artillery Lindemann and Major Kuehn; (*c*) officers on the retired list like General Beck, former Chief of Staff, who had been dismissed by Hitler because of his opposition to the occupation of Czechoslovakia.

While the Nazis pretended at first that the conspiracy was only the plot of a small and desperate group of "idiotic and incapable generals," they had to admit later on that it included also politicians and economic leaders like Goerdeler, the former mayor of Leipzig. Prominent industrialists and financiers, diplomats and officials seem to have taken part in the plot as well, and are suspect.

Although Hitler declared in his speech of July 21st that the action of the rebels was contrary to the spirit of the army and people, later statements admitted that there were widespread ramifications of the rebellion within the army and in certain sections of the population, and that contact had been established at least by some of the participants with the "Free German National Committee" and the "German Officers' League" in Moscow.

According to information handed out by the Nazis themselves, the officers succeeded in using their key positions in the command of the home army and the General Staff in order to communicate with army units. Goering spoke of the establishment of a new government. Hitler declared: "I order . . . that no civilian authority must accept any authority which these usurpers have assumed . . . that no military authority, no commander of troops and no soldier must obey any order by these usurpers; that, on the contrary, everyone is in duty bound either to arrest the person bearing or issuing such an order or to kill him immediately if he offers resistance."

Himmler was appointed Commander of the Home Army and charged with "creating order at last," and by stamping out "this very small clique of traitors and conspirators, at last to create that atmosphere in the rear . . . which the fighting front needs." Troops were used to occupy the War Ministry in Berlin, and there are unconfirmed reports of mass arrests of officers and of armed clashes between army units and S.S. troops.

There can be no doubt that the conspiracy of July 20 included important and powerful groups of the leading

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military and economic circles, former supporters and patrons of Hitler, who have seen that Germany's military and economic position is hopeless and who therefore wanted to remove Hitler. The Nazi leaders and their accomplices were thrown into confusion and panic by this attempt, and in order to keep themselves in power, had to use extreme measures. They shot or hanged those of the leaders whom they could lay hands on and succeeded, at least temporarily, in suppressing the forces in revolt. Temporarily, they strengthened their power afresh by a widespread purge of the army and by new measures of control over the masses, i.e., a further enlargement of the instruments of oppression —the Gestapo and S.S. troops—and the replacement of unreliable commanders, especially on the eastern front. Himmler has, in fact, become the supreme commander of all civilian, para-military and military formations within Germany.

However, the events of July 20 have shown that there are two camps within the leading military and economic circles—the one standing for the immediate cessation of the war, the other for its continuation—and the split which runs right through the army and the people cannot be sealed by ruthless terror or by propaganda. The group of officers and politicians which tried to avert disaster by eliminating Hitler is not the only one which has dissociated itself from the Nazi regime. Since D-Day, and the start of the Russian offensive, the Allies have taken prisoner more than thirty-five generals. These generals, and hundreds of officers with them as well as many thousands of soldiers, were obviously no longer willing to obey Hitler's order to fight to the last drop of blood. They considered it senseless to continue resistance in face of the overwhelming superiority of the Allies and gave themselves up. General Mueller, the Commander of the XII Army Corps—the remnants of which were encircled east of Minsk—ordered his troops to lay down their arms and surrender as the situation was hopeless. Edmund Hoffmeister, another of the generals taken prisoner in Byelorussia, wrote a letter to the Red Army Command in which he described the routing of his troops and the inadequacy and bankruptcy of Hitler's strategy. A few days after the attempt on Hitler's life, sixteen of the German generals captured in Byelorussia published an appeal to generals and officers of the German Armed Forces in which they set out the truth about the situation on the eastern front, made clear the causes of defeat and called for a resolute break with Hitler and his associates. They asked their former colleagues to refuse to obey the orders of Hitler and his representatives, and to cease the fighting and senseless bloodshed forthwith. In agreement with the other signatories of the appeal, four of these generals of the Army Group of the Central Sector then asked for a meeting with Erich Weinert, the president of the "Free German National Committee" and with General von Seydlitz, the President of the "German Officers' League." According to the communique concerning the meeting, full agreement was reached on all questions dealing with the military and political situation and the immediate tasks of the Freedom Movement in its fight against Hitler. Particular stress was laid on the necessity for extending the struggle which has now started against the Hitler regime, by making use of the forces of the German people in every way possible. Each side expressed its determination and readiness for closer co-operation towards the common aim. This is a most significant fact because it shows that at the very moment when the group of generals and officers acted against Hitler within Germany, a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

group of well-known ex-commanders of the Eastern front broke openly with Hitler and his war and started to collaborate with the "Free Germany National Committee." The front of the German opposition against the Hitlerite regime has been enlarged during the last weeks not only by the inclusion of generals and officers, and politicians and economic leaders, but by tens of thousands of soldiers who laid down their arms contrary to Hitler's orders. The opposition within the army and in Germany itself reaches into all sections of the population and is far more widespread than Hitler pretends.

On the ultimate political aims of the officers' revolt, the Nazis have kept silent. Guderian, the new Chief of Staff, declared that they had lost courage and had, out of cowardice and weakness, preferred "the road of disgrace to the road of duty and honour." The radio-commentator Fritsche said that they were ready "to abandon all for which we have fought for five years." Perhaps *The Times* is right when it describes the aims of the plotters as follows: "to prevent the war coming across the German frontiers and by acknowledging defeat 'in good time' to keep the German war machine intact." Many influential persons in Germany have by now, under the blow of the Allied armies and air forces, seen the signs of unavoidable defeat and understood the hopelessness of further resistance. They are out to preserve their positions, their capital and their lives at the price of doing away with Hitler—as *Pravda* put it (July 31). The generals and officers wanted to kill Hitler so as to save Germany from becoming a theatre of war operations, to save the remnants of the army and to seek peace with the Allies. These were their immediate aims. Whatever their ultimate aims—they certainly did not wish to establish a democratic government, but a military dictatorship—had they succeeded, the war would have been shortened considerably. Hitler's continued control means more bloody and bitter fighting for the Allies, a further prolongation of the war. That much is certain.

Hoffmeister's letter and the appeal of the sixteen captured generals give us a clue to the state of mind of the group which acted against Hitler within Germany, and to the appraisal of Germany's situation by leading Germans outside Hitler's circle.

They see the causes of defeat in the adventurist nature of Hitler's political and strategical leadership, in his underestimation of the might of the Soviet Union, in his senseless policy to defend every inch of land held, and in the senseless sacrifice of troops. They accuse him of having brought about, by his policy, the war on two fronts which is bound to end in final defeat, because Germany lacks reserves and because the available troops are therefore constantly in a state of moral and physical overstrain:—

> The political and military leadership of Adolf Hitler and his closest associates has brought about a situation in which a horror-stricken Germany finds herself on the very edge of the precipice.

They are fully convinced of the hopelessness of any further struggle and accuse the Nazis of deceiving the people by concealing the actual state of affairs on the front in order to compel the people to submit to their plan for continued war.

Those whose analysis of Germany's situation leads them to these conclusions were looking for a way out. Hoffmeister writes:

> Germany will have to find an answer to the question of how to create a basis for peace negotiations with other states. They will not negotiate with Hitler, therefore other prerequisites are to be created.

But the generals who have taken action are few in number. The others

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like Guderian, Rommel, Jodl, Kluge and Dittmar, have either irretrievably hitched their star to Hitler's wagon, or, like Leeb and von Kleist, seek comfortable retirement and fear the consequences of action. They are not exempt from their share of responsibility for the continuation of the war nor immune from Hitler's persecution. There are many generals and officers who carry on from a false sense of soldierly duty and thus shoulder their part of responsibility for Hitler's deeds.

Even those who acted inside Germany do not seem to have found ways and means of acting together with the people, i.e., with those sections of the masses who long for peace and are prepared for action—like all those belonging to the underground organisations of the National Peace Movement; like the participants in the People's Councils in East Prussia or in the peace demonstration in Eisenach; like the strikers in Hamburg and Kiel.

In the July days, the "Free German National Committee" asked the rebellious officers to ensure the success of their action by calling on the people, on soldiers, workers, employees, intellectuals, priests, etc. It asked the soldiers to refuse to obey the orders given by commanders who still follow Hitler, to get together and to supplement and cement at the bottom what the generals have started at the top. There is no doubt that the action of July 20 did not succeed above all because the masses of the people were not drawn in in time, because there was, perhaps, fear of a mass movement and because, on the other side, there were prejudices among workers against common action with the generals.

Ley and the other Nazi leaders immediately tried to exploit these sentiments and to turn the working people against those officers who oppose Hitler. The Communist leader Walter Ulbricht, however, said:

It would be unpardonable if an anti-Fascist stood aside passively. Certainly many men were previously on the wrong track, but their eyes have been opened and today they march together with all anti-Fascists against Hitler, for Germany. Let us judge everyone by his deeds of today. The German people is forming its own leadership. Brave men from all ranks of the people are uniting at home in People's Committees. In the factories, fighting committees take over the leadership. In the army units, conscientious officers organise the struggle in agreement with the anti-Hitlerites; where Hitler officers are in charge, courageous men take up the struggle for leadership. The people must mobilise all their forces to overthrow Hitler. (23.7.44.)

While the camp of the anti-Hitlerite forces is slowly forming itself in Germany, Hitler has temporarily succeeded in strengthening his power and continues on his path, aptly described by *The Times* as follows:

To hold out with the utmost fanaticism and to try every manner of political trickery to split the Allies either now or at the peace table.

To stave off their impending doom, Hitler, Goering, Goebbels and Himmler are trying for an even greater total war effort. This new super-total mobilisation spells the waste of the last human and material reserves in Germany, an attempt by the bankrupt Hitler bandits at making the German people believe that there is still today something to be mobilised which could alter the situation.

No new mobilisation, however total, can stop the inexorable course of events or bring about a favourable issue of the war for Hitler and his clique. It is not in Hitler's power to avert the ever more heavy blows struck at the German army by the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. The German army will suffer defeats; German territory will be reached soon not only in the east but also in the south and west. And precisely for this reason Hitler and his gang of loyal generals and henchmen will not be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to avert unrest and discontent among all sections of the population, including the officers' corps. The coming defeats will encourage the sobering up of an ever increasing number of Germans. The basis of the anti-Hitlerite movement in the German army and rear has been broadened during the last months and it will grow further under the blows struck by the Allies.

Naturally the Allies cannot wait until generals, officers and men of the German army finally turn against Hitler and finish the war by laying down arms. They can put their trust only in their own force, in their tanks and aircraft, their guns and mortars. But the word of a Russian commentator should be borne in mind:

The deepening of the internal crisis in Germany—he said—will go forward, parallel with the defeats which the Hitlerite armies will sustain on the different fronts. The outcome of the war will be decided on the battlefield. But what is taking place in Germany itself is an extremely important and essential additional factor helping towards the complete rout of Hitlerite Germany. (*Soviet Monitor*, July 30, 1944).

"Britain for the People"

by G. D. H. COLE

(*The* LABOUR MONTHLY *has invited contributions from leading Labour and progressive representatives on the Communist Party's discussion statement on post-war policy, "Britain for the People." We are glad to publish the following comments from Mr. G. D. H. Cole, Chairman of the Fabian Society*).

"BRITAIN for the People" puts forward a programme which is, in all essentials, at one with the programme of the Labour Party and indeed with the general consensus of British Socialist opinion. The only substantial point on which I find myself in disagreement with it is that, whereas it advocates Proportional Representation, I prefer the Alternative Vote. I think it over-estimates the possibilities of economic agricultural production; but its proposals in this matter are not precise enough for me to be able to say whether they involve a serious difference of view. I too, of course, want to see the land of Britain more fully used after the war; but I am fearful of policies which seem to stress higher agricultural production without full regard to considerations of real cost in terms of human labour. I feel sure that we should again after the war import the main part of our requirements in bulk foodstuffs and feeding stuffs and develop home production mainly in the field of quality foodstuffs of high nutritive value. This may be what is meant; but it is not made plain. Of course, I am speaking of long-term policy and not of the immediate future. For some time after the war the essential thing will be to maintain, broadly, the war food economy, until European agriculture has got back into its stride.

I should have liked to see more stress laid on the forms of control over industries still left in capitalist hands, not only from the standpoint of control of monopoly—which the statement does adequately emphasise—but also from the standpoint of reorganisation and improved efficiency. This is no doubt implied; but the methods are not worked out. It is part of the same criticism that not enough is said about the character of the machinery that will be needed for co-ordinated social and economic planning. Foreign trade and its problems are also touched on much too lightly. The problem of the British post-war balance of payments is a real problem, and will involve

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great difficulties no matter what Government may be in power.

In relation to India and the Empire, is it enough to stand for Indian independence and for the "speediest liberation" of colonial peoples? In relation to India, I want to make sure that we Socialists take the side of the Indian peoples, rather than of nascent Indian capitalism; and in relation to the Colonies I want a programme covering what can be done at once towards raising colonial standards of living, health and education, and leading towards the full liberation that is promised. I want also to know where we stand in relation to the Colonies of other imperial countries—I mean in respect of collaboration in dealing with colonial problems across imperial frontiers as well as within them.

The main question, however, is not one of programme, on which all Socialists are very largely in agreement, but one of tactics, strategy and method. These are questions which are hardly discussed, except by implication, in "Britain for the People;" but they are the questions which need discussion most of all. It appears from "Britain for the People" that the Communist Party is not expecting, or working for, a British Socialist or Communist Revolution in the post-war period, but aims rather at a semi-Socialist structure. I agree; but clearly such a structure will work out in quite different ways according to the real location of political power. It would be quite possible to administer a semi-Socialist structure in a most anti-Socialist way; and there would be immense forces of conservative tradition ranged on the side of doing this. Only a really strong and determined Socialist Government, with a vigorous and instructed Socialist movement behind it, could achieve the Socialist use of semi-Socialist instruments of power. This demands a united working-class and Socialist leadership among the people; and this leadership is what we most of all lack. It is easy, making programmes; but it is not nearly so easy to forge the human leadership that is needed for carrying them into effect. Nor is there any hope of doing this, except on a basis of real mutual understanding and confidence between the Socialists of Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Danger Signals in Indian Economy

by S. A. DANGE

FIVE years of a modern total war, requiring the complete mobilisation of a country's economic and moral forces, have produced, in the leading capitalist countries of the democratic bloc, a centralised control of production and distribution, a growth in the productive forces, a system of rationing and price-control, which affords the people some protection from the rapacity of the profiteers and harmonises the demands of the front and the rear. In England, the people could be saved from famine, demoralisation and defeat because the anarchy in the sphere of production and distribution was to a great extent overcome in the first two years of the war.

It was the existing democratic institutions and the National Government established on their basis which carried through this change. The first step in that direction was *political*—clean-up of the Munichites from the Government. The second was economic—rigid control over production and distribution, though the latter was slow to come. The people could be mobilised morally and physically only on the basis of these vital political and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic changes in the life of the country.

In India no such changes took place. The country, politically and economically, was a prey of imperialist politics and economics. The Government of the country reflected the monopoly interests of British capital and not the democratic interests of the Indian people. It tried to mobilise the resources of the country for the war in Europe, before Japan attacked and then for the war in Asia. But being a bureaucracy divorced from the people, it failed to harmonise the demands of the front with the needs of the people. For the same reason, it failed to plan production and distribution. The result was an inevitable breakdown in the economy of the country, which already was too poor to meet the needs of "a modern war of motors." Threatened with this collapse, the bureaucracy relied on the mere force of the all-powerful State, on repression of the people on the one hand, and partial concessions to profiteering interests on the other.

The result was that the threat of economic collapse became a fact. It was brought to the attention of the world by crowded prisons and by the three million corpses of the Indian famine.

There were no plans of production to utilise existing resources in an efficient manner and to augment them whenever possible. India has no heavy industry to produce the means of production. The military crisis on the Continent and England cut off supplies even of spare parts for replacements. Instead of augmenting the productive capacity by basic extensions, higher production was secured for a time by increased shift working and by the incentive of high boom prices and profits. The picture will be clearly seen if we take five strategic items of industrial production, which have developed to some extent in India—such as (1) iron, (2) steel, (3) cotton textiles, (4) jute textiles, and (5) coal. Production in 1941-42 over that of 1938-39 was as follows:

	1930-39	1941-42
Pig Iron (tons)	1,575,500	1,800,000
Steel ,,	977,400	1,200,000
Coal ,,	28 mill.	28 mill.
Cloth (mil. yds.)	4,115	4,530
Jute ,,	1,774	1,967

Pig iron increased by 14 per cent., steel by 23 per cent., cotton cloth by 10 per cent., jute by 10 per cent. But the danger spot of the whole position was already visible in coal, which did not increase and later, in 1943, showed a serious decline.

In all these increases there was no co-ordination of plant capacity, allocation of materials, markets or labour. It was anarchy of production, intensified by the war-boom and utilised by profiteers.

The increase in production was achieved not only without any increase in basic capacity, but also at the cost of the progressive impoverishment of the people and the country. The working-class cost of living increased, as there was no price-control. But the increased cost of living was not covered by a proportional or even substantial rise in wages. No section of the working-class, whether highly organised in Trade Unions or not, could get a wage increase without a strike, i.e., a threat to production. The best organised workers (in Bombay), in spite of the increases secured from time to time, could not keep pace with the rising cost of living, and suffered a fall in wages to the extent of 30 per cent. In Calcutta, the fall was 60 per cent. This resulted in a lowering of efficiency and an increase in sickness and absenteeism. The attempt to transfer war-burdens to the shoulders of the working-class, by impoverishing the working-class, was bound to result in a severe crisis of production—as came in at a later stage in 1943. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government of India, while refusing to freeze prices, directly supported and inspired the employers in freezing wages.

But the threat to the economy of the country developed mainly on the food front. Agricultural economy in India, as a result of imperialist policy, had failed to develop even to the point of supporting the needs of the country's population on the lowest standard of living. The towns and the non-agricultural population, drawing supplies from the market, had to depend upon the vast uncoordinated movements of small scale farmers, 75 per cent. of whose products were expropriated in rent by a rapacious landed gentry, in interest by usurers and in prices by the capitalist market. In the absence of a central food plan, price-control, and national rationing, the food-market, strained by the extra demands of the army and by exports, was the first to collapse. Rice, the staple food, which was Rs.4-14-0 per maund of 82 pounds in Calcutta in 1939, had risen to Rs.14/- in February, 1943. The wholesale price index of rice rose to 218 in December, 1942, over August, 1939, as 100. But by December, 1943, according to the Economic Adviser of the Government of India, it had jumped to 951.

The Government of India failed to procure stocks enough to supply the big industrial centres where production of vital goods was going on. Working hours were lost in a hunt for food. Coal-mining areas in the two large coal producing provinces were denuded of food and other supplies. Coal production fell from 28 million tons in 1942 to 22 millions in 1943. Workers deprived of food and plants deprived of fuel—production was in serious danger.

The production indices show the picture as follows:

Base 1935-36 = 100.

	1941-42	42-43	Sept. 43	Oct.
Coal	116.6	114.7	107.0	109.0
Cotton	150.3	154.4	170.1	157.0
Jute	122.1	117.8	68.0	83.1
Iron	141.6	130.6	108.5	146.1
Steel	157.3	144.2	112.0	161.1

	Nov.	Dec.	Jan. 1944
Coal	115.0	110.0	115.0
Cotton	166.4	161.7	157.5
Jute	102.4	79.0	101.0
Iron	178.6	83.5	108.5
Steel	198.9	84.9	112.0

The crisis in food was not so much of production as of distribution. The crisis in coal was both of production and distribution.

The reactions of the Government to the crisis were not marked by any set policy in the economic field. Politically they had the set policy of refusing to let the major political parties of the country handle the affairs of the country. Economically, they played with the price market, inflated currency to an unheard-of extent. Currency note circulation, which was 1,723 million rupees in August, 1939, rose to 3,084 million Rs. on an average in 1941-42. And as the collapse became more visible and goods refused to flow in, it was further inflated to Rs.8,408 million in December, 1943. This inflation made the collapse worse.

When people began to fall dead in the streets and workers were forced to leave factories or go on strike for want of food and other essential consumer goods, the Government was moved to think seriously of price-controls, rationing, allocation of transport, and productive capacity, and procurement of food stocks and distribution from a central plan. Rationing was for the first time introduced in May, 1943, in Bombay. But Calcutta, the largest city in India, with four and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a half million population, did not get it till 1944. According to the Government, 234 cities with a population of 35 millions, are today under rationing. This is a false or exaggerated claim. While the Secretary of State on July 28 was making this claim, which included the large cities of famine-stricken Bengal, the Governor of Bengal was saying almost the same day that the famous town of Dacca was not yet on rationing. Frantic efforts to release transport and rush supplies to certain key industries checked for a time the disastrous curve of falling production. Currency inflation was reduced to Rs.5,782 in January, 1944, and several controls were announced.

But all these were bureaucratic measures relying on the administrative machinery alone for their success. The industrialists, for so long suppressed in their growth by the denial of industrialisation of the country, are not prepared to submit to controls—especially when four-fifths of their profits are going to the State, which, as they see it, does not serve them, but foreign interests. The working-class and the people are not allowed to organise and not asked to co-operate in the administration of controls for fear of the "growing people's power." For the same reason, the great patriotic parties like the National Congress and Muslim League are denied any effective share in the political-economic management of the country's affairs. The inevitable result is continuance of famine, production not restored to the level of its highest capacity, stocks of food not coming in (see the Government Food Member's admission), and rationing, except in a few cases, merely a mockery.

A recent meeting of the Textile Control Board and the Administrative heads of the Provinces came to the conclusion that control in the matter of textile production and distribution had failed and was on the point of breakdown. A big Bristol combine (no wonder!) reported, in July, 1944, "*largest profits ever made, despite control.*" The bright hopes of the Secretary of State (Mr. Amery) that the food situation is in hand, are belied by the price-market and stocks. *Wheat* in Hapur Market, which was Rs.8/- per maund of 82 lbs. in January, 1943 (pre-war rate Rs.3/-) had risen to 11/8 in January, 1944. Rice had jumped from Rs.13/- to 20/-. The statement made by the Government that this year prices are tending to fall, is not borne out by the facts.

Thus the attempt of the British Government to run Indian economy without the co-operation of the people has failed. It has failed to safeguard war production and keep the front free from a shaky rear. It has only brought famine, collapse, and bitterness. Instead of the unity of the people with the United Nations, the vast colonial masses of India stand isolated from the greatest struggle in history, in bitterness.

Who then can deny that the only solution is to change this Government and hand over to the political parties of the people for which a way has been opened by Mahatma Gandhi's new approach?

Why not take out a subscription?

Many of our old readers, and also new readers, still find difficulty in obtaining their copy of the magazine regularly. So long as the restriction on our paper supplies imposed by the Paper Control continues, this difficulty will persist. But readers can insure themselves against these interruptions in their regular reading by taking out a year's subscription (7s., post free).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Liberation of Poland

by QUAESTOR

WITH the publication of the Manifesto of the Polish Committee of National Liberation of July 22, 1944, a great landmark has been reached in the history, not only of Poland or even of Eastern Europe, but of Europe as a whole. In order to realise its importance, we have to view the history of our continent, not merely from 1917, but from 1848—"the year of revolutions."

In that year the whole of Central Europe, dominated by the reactionary States of militarist Prussia, imperial Austria-Hungary, and Tsardom, rose in democratic revolution. Feudal reaction was saved by the armies of Tsarist Russia. Prussia acquired the opportunity of conquering, or otherwise subjugating, a vast territory which, after three successful wars, it formed into the German Empire in 1871. From that time forward imperialism developed in the whole of the eastern half of Europe under the control of a class of feudal landowners in each Empire. And even in Poland, kept in subjection and division by the three Empires, a feudal landowning class (which had already betrayed the Polish people in the national insurrections of 1791, 1830 and 1863) was allowed to share in the privileges of the ruling cliques of the respective Empires.

In the first World War the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires were defeated, and the latter broken up. The Russian Empire was overthrown by the Russian workers and peasants who established the power of the Soviets, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks. But just as the victorious Allies, in fear of the extension of Socialism westward, stepped in and rescued the overthrown Junkers and capitalists of Germany—through their willing agents the German Social-Democrats and the military clique who promised to save Germany from Bolshevism—so all along the Soviet border the Allied Governments threw up, in whatever form they could, what in their blindness they thought to be a "sanitary cordon" against the baleful Soviet influence. In order to do this, they had to place in power, all along the border, the worst elements of black reaction. Thus it was that the bloody Mannerheim clique in Finland, the terrorist dictatorships in the Baltic States, were able to establish themselves and hold power for over twenty years. Thus it was that the tottering, corrupt feudal regimes of Hungary and Rumania were propped up for a new lease of life. Thus it was that the Polish people, emancipated at last after nearly 150 years of national subjection, found itself saddled with the rule of a feudal clique, politically and morally no further advanced than it was in the eighteenth century, but with the additional means at its disposal which were furnished by a certain amount of capitalist development in Poland, but, above all, by support from the strongholds of western finance capital.

The Polish people, which had furnished to the whole world matchless examples of dauntless self-abnegation and herosim in its struggle for national freedom, found itself instead, from 1921 onwards, in the unexpected role of a new bulwark of European feudal reaction, an outpost of blind and besotted anti-Soviet intrigue and adventure. One striking outward sign of this was the whittling away, and final scrapping, of the democratic Polish Constitution of 1921, which began almost as soon as it had come into force. Under that constitution, the two Chambers of the Polish Parliament were to be elected by universal adult suffrage at 21, with proportional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

representation. The President of the Republic, elected for seven years by the two Chambers in joint session, had in general the ordinary duties and privileges of a Head of State in a democratic country, without political or personal responsibility for the conduct of public affairs. These were to be the concern of a Government responsible to Parliament. Freedom of conscience, equality of all nationalities inhabiting Poland in political, economic, cultural and linguistic respects, were guaranteed.

The latter guarantees were specially repeated in a minorities' Treaty to which Poland subscribed in 1920, and by the Soviet-Polish Peace Treaty of Riga in 1921.

By 1935, none of this existed. The Constitution of that year subordinated the Government, the two Chambers of Parliament, the armed forces and the Courts to the President, who was declared to be only responsible "before God and history." He could dismiss ministers, judges, Parliament, at any time. In order to provide a Parliament which could be relied upon, all political parties were prohibited; furthermore, while the voting age for the lower Chamber was retained at twenty-one, candidates had to be thirty years of age, and must be selected by special "electoral colleges," composed of representatives of the landowners, manufacturers and merchants, with a Government official presiding. For the Senate, one-third of the deputies were to be nominated by the President, and two-thirds by a body of about 300,000 persons handpicked by the Government.

It is hardly surprising that this Constitution, which really only brought to a head reactionary inroads on freedom in progress for the previous twelve to fifteen years, aroused such disgust that, at the first elections held under it in September, 1935, about two-thirds of the voters boycotted the polls.

In the economic and social fields, the survival of feudal reaction, corruption, robbery of the people was even more marked. Sixteen thousand landlords owned 45 per cent. of the land. At the other end of the scale, small holdings of under 12 acres represented 60 per cent. of all properties: in fact, nearly half of these had under 5 acres. Nearly half the peasants had not even a horse. The majority lived on potatoes and rye bread. "Were it not for the lowly potato . . . the masses would long since have been done for," writes a well-known apologist for the Polish reactionaries, Professor Rose (*Poland*, pp. 154-5). In industry, the position was no better: average wages were 12s. a week for men, 6s. for women, and the level of goods consumed per head was "one of the lowest in Europe" (Rose, p. 97). Trade Unions and workers' parties could only exist provided they accepted police supervision and control. The officer caste were all-powerful: Poland was the only country in Europe where officers could shoot civilians with impunity if they considered that "the honour of their uniform" had been besmirched.

Worst of all was the position of the subject nationalities—not only the Jews, subjected to all kinds of shameful indignities and medieval restrictions on political and economic liberty, which kept them in misery, but also the Ukrainians and Belorussians snatched from Soviet Russia in 1920, who were treated as colonial serfs. Their schools were almost entirely suppressed, Polish landowners owning huge estates had almost complete right of life and death over them, and wages were 30 to 40 per cent. lower than even the miserable level in the rest of the country.

This was the legacy with which Poland was plunged into war by the criminal pro-Hitler and anti-Soviet policy of its previous rulers, who by their intrigues left their people practi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cally defenceless against the Nazi aggressor. The gallant resistance movement which has sprung up in Poland, and which today is led by the underground National Council and the Committee of National Liberation formed by it, has made clear that, in fighting against the hated German invader, it is fighting for a free and democratic Poland. The Polish Army in the U.S.S.R., formed on the initiative of the Union of Polish Patriots in the Soviet Union who have now placed themselves under the leadership of the Committee of National Liberation, has from the very beginning proclaimed its allegiance to the principles of democracy and social progress. These principles have found practical expression in the Manifesto of July 22. They are worth the most profound study just because they voice the demands of a people fighting both the Nazis and the regime which brought the Nazis to Poland. They afford a practical illustration of what national liberation means in Europe of 1944, at all events for those many tens of millions who have been suffering under feudal survivals for so many years. This will be most obvious if we compare them with the main facts of the regime between 1921 and 1939, set out earlier.

The Manifesto provides, in the first place, that the Constitution of 1921 *comes into force again, pending the* holding of a constituent Assembly elected in the freest, most democratic way possible. The democratic organisations locally and regionally are to create People's Councils in the meantime. The administrative bodies formed by the Nazis are to be dissolved, and their Quisling "Blue Police" dissolved also, to be replaced by a civil militia from the ranks of the resistance forces. Full democratic liberties are to be restored, but Fascist organisations all the more rigorously prosecuted and suppressed; similarly, while property looted by the invaders must be restored to its owners, German property is to be confiscated. The Jews are specially guaranteed equality, restoration of their stolen property, and fullest possible help to revive from the awful abyss of misery into which those of them who survive have been plunged. Industrial, commercial, banking and transport property of national significance is to be under State control, pending restoration to its owners.

But the most significant section of the Manifesto is that which breaks the back of feudalism in Poland, whether native or artificially created by the Nazis, and lays the basis for democracy by destroying the economic power of the serfowners. A Land Fund is set up, composed of land taken from the Germans and from traitors (confiscated purely and simply) and of landlords' estates exceeding 50 hectares (125 acres). In the latter case, the former owners will be provided for as citizens, without receiving compensation. The land is to be distributed, for a minimum payment, to poor peasants, middle peasants, small tenants, farmers with large families and agricultural labourers, as their property. The basis of distribution is to ensure that an average family has 5 hectares (12½ acres) of usable land of average quality. Territory which will be taken from Germany is to be used for resettlement in this connection. Beyond small taxes in kind, at far lower rates than the Nazis extorted, the peasants will be relieved of any kind of burden —the deliveries in kind being only such as are necessary to meet the needs of the armed forces and the towns.

While the State will support private enterprise "which quickens the pulse of economic life"—an important indication—it will encourage the large-scale development of co-operatives.

The rest of the Manifesto aims at ensuring to the population at large

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minimum standards of decency, comfort and cultural opportunities, parallel with the great agrarian reform. Wages are to be raised to a living level: social insurance is to be restored and expanded, with a democratic system of self-government in the organisations of the insured; labour protection laws and provisions for housing development, the restoration of the school system and compulsory universal education, with special care for the intelligentsia, whom the German barbarians took a special delight in degrading and exterminating—these indispensable measures make up the programme.

Obviously a Poland liberated for such a future, by the united forces of the Red Army, the Polish Army in the U.S.S.R. and the Polish resistance movement, will be a country immune from the sinister influences of the last twenty-five years. It will be a centre radiating progressive inspiration in Eastern Europe, a citadel of self-respecting democracy capable of rebuilding national prosperity to a level never dreamt of in any previous age by the Polish people. Naturally, the Manifesto has won the enthusiastic support of the vast majority of fighting Poles. Naturally, too, it has won the flattery of hypocritical imitation at the hands of anti-Soviet Poles grouped around the emigrant Government in London, who revealed to the world, through the B.B.C. on July 30, that they had just been going to publish a scheme of reform which, curiously enough, was for all the world like a pale copy of the Manifesto—with new democratic electoral laws, the State dividing up estates over 125 acres, "self-government" in industry and social insurance, universal education, and all.

However, the ridiculous side of this imitation is less important than its political lesson. The message of the Manifesto of July 22 is so compelling and vigorous that it has swept right across political barriers. Is not this a portent that its example will sweep, must sweep, across national barriers as well—that, wherever the peoples are rising in arms against the Nazi horror, to the thunder of the Allied guns from the borderlands of Nazi-ridden Europe, they will see to it that the reactionary barriers set up against democracy, both in 1848-49 and in 1919-20, are at long last swept away?

Communism and Italian Unity

by PALMIRO TOGLIATTI

Minister Without Portfolio in the Italian Government.

(Translation of an article published by *L'Unita*, organ of the Italian Communist Party in Naples, on May 21, 1944.)

OF all the lying, defamatory campaigns conducted by Fascism in order to consolidate usurped power by sowing confusion and discord among the people, the most tenacious, the most systematic, and it can also be said, the most shameful, was the campaign against Communism.

With the downfall of Fascism, it was to be hoped that the matter was ended, and ended forever. And in a certain sense it is; for, the attempts to exclude the Communist Party from the united front of democratic, anti-fascist and national forces, even if they have existed, have had no success whatsoever.

Solidly backed by the working-class and by the great masses of workers, the Communist Party presented itself and gained recognition as the most determined among the anti-Hitlerite,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-fascist forces; and moreover as a national force aware of the interests of the country, desirous and capable of fighting in defence of these interests.

One by one the anti-Communist lies and calumnies of fascism fell and continue to fall. Truth advances. Truth triumphs. Communism, the advance-guard ideology and organisation of the working-class, has not only regained the rights of citizenship which the evildoers responsible for our country's catastrophe would have wanted to deny it; but it is rapidly conquering the sympathies and adherence of those who in the present tragic situation seek a disinterested and secure guide.

Communism is disinterested because it is based exclusively on the interests of workers, peasants, and of honest and laborious intellectuals, i.e., of the enormous majority of the nation. It is secure, because its realistic concept of the world, in itself, permits the development of a course of action which adheres perfectly to the realities of our national life.

In this situation, we ask—is it in the interest of those who have a religious faith and particularly of those who are its exponents to occupy, as champions of "anti-Communism," the place left empty by the blackshirt propagandists and officials? Anyone endowed with a mere grain of common sense will not hesitate one single moment to give to this question a decidedly negative answer. And this because of two principal motives.

The first motive is that, although anti-Communist propaganda might have temporary success among certain backward elements in Italy today, in the last analysis, such propaganda discredits, not those against whom it is directed, but the very ones who make it.

Is it feasible to present us, the Communists, as "enemies of society," when we, instead, have been the most unrelenting, deadly foe of Hitlerism and fascism, i.e., of the barbarity which threatens all of us, which the people hates and wishes to see destroyed?

Is it feasible in this country, which for twenty years has been governed by a band of thieves and racketeers, to denounce as "enemies of private property," the Communists, the very people who have fought against the regime of theft, violence, and crime for twenty years, without hesitations, without compromises, sacrificing all that we could sacrifice?

Is it feasible to rehash before the people the filthy fascist and Hitlerite calumnies against the Soviet Union, when the Italian people know that they are debtors to the Soviet Union for their liberation from fascist shame, when all the civilised world admires the Soviet nation as the victorious champion of civilisation, freedom, justice and progress against Hitlerite barbarity?

But the second motive which leads us to advise the religious leaders not to take this path, or at least not to continue on it, is much more important.

The forces of the Italian people have been too long divided. It is a certainty that religion did not derive any profit from their division. The fascists and Hitler did. Hatred against fascism, the desire to free themselves forever from every residue of the regime which brought about Italy's ruin, and above all, the need to create in our country political and social conditions which will satisfy the most profound aspirations for peace, liberty, welfare and social justice, are sentiments shared alike by Catholic workers and by those who are not Catholic.

Why sow confusion and discord among the people when unity is necessary? We are, perhaps, the only party which has never indulged in anti-clericalism. Our profound respect

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for every religious conviction offers the possibility of an accord and of collaboration with the democratic movement of Catholic workers, inspired by the single aim of destroying fascist barbarity forever, and of opening the way for the sacred triumph of the aspirations of the workers.

Responsible Catholic leaders should reflect upon these words. As for others, they should remember that, today, identifying the cause of anti-Communism with the cause of religion signifies rendering religion the worst possible service.

CHINA'S DESTINY

by CHEN PAI-TA

(As explained in an earlier issue, we are able to print only the more important sections of the critique of Chiang Kai-shek's book. The following section ("On the Kuomintang-Communist Relations") has a bearing on the present critical situation in China.—Ed. L.M.)

MR. Chiang has disregarded all the main historical facts of the first Kuomintang-Communist co-operation and has made false, vicious accusations against the heroic and patriotic Chinese Communist Party. There are provocative words in this part of the book aimed at inflaming the people's enmity against the Chinese Communists. It is therefore necessary to bring to light once more pages of great importance in our history vitally connected with China's destiny.

In 1924, the Kuomintang was reorganised, and the first period of co-operation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party was initiated under the direction of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. At that time, Dr. Sun was maintaining himself in Canton, in a tiny corner of South China. His revolutionary banner was not bright and his power did not extend beyond his own headquarters. All military, political, financial and other authority was in the hands of war-lords who practised counter-revolution under the revolutionary flag. And the Kuomintang did not have a single, healthy revolutionary organisation anywhere in China strong enough to help the revolution.

It was at that time and under these conditions that Dr. Sun Yat-sen, with his brilliant farsightedness, asked for the help of the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties. The Chinese Communist Party at once came forth sincerely to give Dr. Sun the aid, which together with help in every respect from the Soviet Union, made possible the reorganisation of the Kuomintang and created a situation completely new in the Chinese Revolution.

First, regarding the revolutionary banner and revolutionary programme, before this co-operation, the Kuomintang had no programme against imperialism and against the feudal system. The nationalism of the Three People's Principles was originally meant to oppose the Manchus, and it became deficient in content once the Manchus were overthrown. This historical fact has been stated in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's *Past Events of the Chinese Revolution* and has been proved by all his works. The revolution against imperialism—is one of the main principles of the Chinese revolution. Without the anti-imperialistic movement, China would never get rid of her semi-colonial position, but on the contrary would become a colony of Japanese imperialism. The hoisting of the banner of anti-imperialist revolution and the carrying out of the revolutionary movement to oppose im-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perialism and to abolish the unequal treaties were important events, enabling the Chinese revolution to advance to a completely new stage, from the old democratic revolution to the new democratic revolution.

The Kuomintang's principle of democracy in the San Min Chu I (Three People's Principles) before the reorganisation in 1924, was an expression of the old democracy which lacked the content of thorough struggle against the feudalistic system and for the liberation of the broad masses of working people. The principles of democracy and of people's livelihood had to be imbued with new content by setting out clearly the anti-feudal slogans. Only in this way could the revolutionary Chinese people again be mobilised in a revolutionary direction, and the Kuomintang proceed along a proper revolutionary way and acquire new vitality through unity with the revolutionary people.

The questions should be asked: Who were the first to bring such a clear revolutionary policy to the Chinese people? Who helped Dr. Sun Yat-sen to turn this revolutionary programme into the programme of the Kuomintang? Who other than the Chinese Communist Party? Since the revolution of 1911, the Kuomintang had been isolated, ignored by the people and the youth. After its reorganisation, the situation changed. The Kuomintang began to connect with the people and once more to draw the youth. Was this not because of the new programme against imperialism and feudalism? Besides, thanks to the brilliant far-sightedness of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and his real supporters in the Kuomintang, should not the Kuomintang feel any gratitude to the Chinese Communist Party for this new programme? Should it not ascribe any merit to the Chinese Communist Party?

The author of *China's Destiny* himself experienced these events. Please reflect. Why does he not write down the page of history? Is it "justice" to disregard it? Is it "honesty"?

Furthermore, were there any troops under Generalissimo Sun Yat-sen which could be counted on as a revolutionary army before the reorganisation of the Kuomintang? Were there any troops which could stand a battle? Dr. Sun had attempted many Northern Expeditions; but was there a single expedition that was successful? Things changed after the reorganisation. The Whampoa Academy was established to train revolutionary cadets. The men who initiated the foundation and organisation of the academy were Dr. Sun Yat-sen, Mr. Liao Chung-kai and the Russian advisers. The author of *China's Destiny* did not then recognise the importance of this academy, and did not even want to be the president.

This was how the first revolutionary troops came into being. They defeated Chen Chun-ming twice; they beat down Yang Shi-min and Liu Tsenghuan and were at last able to carry out the Northern Expedition. The foundation and achievements of the revolutionary army at that time were unprecedented. For several decades, Dr. Sun had failed in his quest for the right direction. But in co-operation with the Chinese Communist Party and the Soviet Union, great military successes were achieved within a few short years. By whose merit was it that the Kuomintang was capable of extending its power to Wuhan and Nanking and of holding its position today? Please reflect! Why don't they write down this page of history? Is it "justice" to disregard these facts? Is this called "honesty"?

Mr. Chiang says:—

The Kuomintang arose from the original, national moralities, with affection, faith, responsibility and duty as the basic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles of organising the party. Unlike other parties and groups, it does not use dextreous tricks and cruel intrigues at all, nor does it resort to self-interest and selfishness as its instinct of combination.

Well, please look into history! History is the witness. The help which the Chinese Communist Party rendered to the Kuomintang was so great and so decisive, that since 1924, all the revolutionary achievements of the Kuomintang have been inseparable from the name of the Chinese Communist Party. In the military sphere, for instance, how many Chinese Communists and members of the Communist Youth League sacrificed their lives in the two Eastern campaigns and on several fronts of the Northern Expedition while dashing forward at the head of their fellow soldiers? Mr. Chiang himself acknowledged that the blood sacrificed by the Communists and the Kuomintang members is inseparable when he wrote a preface to the Alumni Souvenir Album of the Whampoa Academy.

But what did the representatives of the big bourgeoisie offer the Communists as a "reward"? Having unified Kwangtung Province and gained a certain position, the representatives of the big capitalists doublecrossed the Communists, upon whom they had formerly depended. The so-called "Incident of the Gunboat Chungsan" was fabricated on March 20, 1926. The incident, according to the author, was plotted by the Communist Party. But historical examples are plentiful. Did not Hitler talk of a plot by the German Communist Party after he burnt the Reichstag? The reason the representatives of the Chinese big bourgeoisie carried out such a criminal plot on March 20 was that they wanted a pretext for driving the Chinese Communists from the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, from the Whampoa Academy, and from the main posts of the National Revolutionary Army. They wanted to restrict the activities of the Communists within the Kuomintang. They created this plot because they knew well that the Chinese Communist Party did not want to break the united front and they expected that the Communists were honest enough to be easily cheated.

Was that "reason"? Was that not playing "dextreous tricks or cruel intrigues"? Was that not "self-interest and selfishness"? Was that "justice"? Was that "honesty"?

Nevertheless, the man who plotted the March 20 Incident was not yet prepared to annihilate all the Communists because he had not yet arrived at Nanking, because the Communists still had certain usefulness for him. We shall not discuss here the many serious faults within the Communist Party under the opportunist leadership of Chen Tu-hsiu. But it was definitely correct for the Chinese Communists at that time to insist upon co-operation with the Kuomintang and to support the line of the Northern Expedition. While holding this correct line, the Chinese Communists heroically participated in military operations. Among the great number of party representatives and political workers in all the main forces of the National Revolutionary Army whose victories amazed the world, were not the majority members of the Chinese Communist Party and the Communist Youth League? The Chinese Communists had also organised the people, organised plain-clothes squadrons throughout the country, organised three workers' uprisings in Shanghai to co-ordinate with the action of the military forces, and created a Great Revolution unprecedented in China.

On the one hand, the representatives of the big capitalists perceived the necessity for using the Communists and revolutionary workers and peasants to serve their own purpose of ar-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

riving at Nanking and securing the controlling position in the country. On the other hand, they prepared for the massacre under the name of the "purge" once they had succeeded in these objectives.

The fault of the Communists then was that they were too innocent. They paid no attention to the cruel counter-revolutionary intrigues of the big bourgeoisie while they were helping the Northern Expedition and launching the Great Revolution. And the guilt of the opportunist leadership of Chen Tu-hsiu lies in the fact that it actually helped the successful realisation of this counter-revolutionary scheme.

There is no past example in Chinese history, even in world history, of the horrors of the "purge" which began on April 12, 1927. Innumerable heroic and patriotic Communists, revolutionary workers and peasants, as well as members of the Kuomintang who were really faithful to revolutionary principles and to the Three Policies of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, fell suddenly and unexpectedly under the executioners' swords of the big bourgeoisie.

We have long ceased to talk about the above-mentioned events. We have been tolerant indeed during the war of resistance for the cause of the country. But now Mr. Chiang has mentioned these events and made all kinds of vicious and slanderous accusations against the Communist Party. Indeed, we Communists and all the Chinese people would with justice and enthusiasm let those things be forgotten if they were not mentioned. But once they are mentioned, our hearts cannot help being filled with boiling anger, because the Chinese Communists have shed their blood! It is the blood of innumerable revolutionaries and able young men and toiling workers and peasants! It is the blood of the élite of this nation! Since the beginning of the "purge," too many people died under the sword of the Kuomintang! Too many! Too many!

Mr. Chiang says:—

I cannot make clear even today the inside story of the Wang-Communist collaboration — whether the Communist Party was utilised by Wang Ching-wei, or Wang Ching-wei was utilised by the Communist Party, or whether they were mutually-utilised.

This question which Mr. Chiang advances is a strange one indeed. But it involves a big plot. It is hinted that the Chinese Communists conspired with the traitor Wang Ching-wei. Well, let us look at history. Everybody knows that in the course of the Great Revolution of 1925-27, there was not only a "Wang-Communist collaboration" when Wang Ching-wei was still revolutionary, but also a "Chiang-Communist collaboration" when Mr. Chiang was still revolutionary. There was also a "Chiang-Wang collaboration" when Wang Ching-wei was still revolutionary. At that time, why should we not have collaborated with him? Just as at the time when you, Mr. Chiang, were still revolutionary, why should we not have collaborated with you?

As for "utilising," the matter of who utilised others is too clear a historical fact. The Communists have no need to utilise anyone; but they believe it is necessary to co-operate with certain people under the condition that such co-operation is favourable to the revolution. But there were some persons who really intended to make use of the Communists. They made use of the situation when it was favourable to them, but if anything occurred to impede their own aims, they murdered their friends. Wang Ching-wei did so and so did Chiang Kai-shek.

Let us put these questions to Mr. Chiang. After the Mukden Incident on September 18, 1931, Wang Ching-wei

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collaborated for a long time with Mr. Chiang. Wang Ching-wei had not signed treacherous agreements and become a traitor at the time of the "Wang-Communist collaboration." But things were completely different at the time of the "Wang-Chiang collaboration." As the President of the Executive Yuan and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Wang Ching-wei put forth the treacherous policy of "negotiation while preparing for defence," signed the Shanghai Truce, the Tangku Truce and the Ho-Umetzu Agreement, proclaimed a "good neighbour policy" and negotiated with Japan. After the outbreak of the war of resistance, when Mr. Chiang became the Director-General of the Kuomintang, Wang Ching-wei became the Vice-Director and was appointed by the C.E.C. of the Kuomintang to the chairmanship of the People's Political Council, and other posts. But he escaped from Chungking to Nanking and became the No. 1 traitor. We cannot make clear even today the inside story of all these collaborations, whether Wang Ching-wei was utilised by Chiang Kai-shek or Chiang Kai-shek was utilised by Wang Ching-wei, or whether they mutually utilised each other.

Writing of the failure of the national revolution midway in its course and the split between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party in 1927, which aroused a civil war lasting ten years Mr. Chiang blames the whole crime on the greedy hands of the traitor Wang Ching-wei by saying that "It happened because of the tragedy of the split between Nanking and Wuhan." Here it seems that the author deprecates himself and honours the traitor Wang Ching-wei too much. Please have an eye on history and see how the split between Nanking and Wuhan really took place. Was it not due to the "party purge" that began on April 12, 1927? Whose greedy hands were responsible for the "purge" of April 12? Was it not you, Mr. Chiang, who should have the credit?

It was after the split between Nanking and Wuhan, not before the split, that Wang Ching-wei went to Wuhan and speculated in Revolution. When Wuhan was menaced by the imperialists and the reactionary Nanking Government, Wang Ching-wei turned from wavering to reaction. Did not the "purging movement" of Wang Ching-wei follow your "purging movement" against the Communists, Mr. Chiang?

The author's idea in the cited paragraph seems to be that the Communist Party would have been annihilated once for all, and that the "Communist problem" would exist no longer, had it not been for the Wuhan Government. The author is wrong. Under any circumstance, the Communists can never be wiped out by slaughtering. The Communists never die. The Chinese Communist Party is like "the wild grass which can never be burnt away and which will grow again under the spring breeze." History has proved this.

Mr. Chiang Kai-shek further enumerates many of the so-called "crimes" allegedly committed by the Communist Party. But "crimes" cannot be manufactured so easily. Mr. Chiang has slaughtered without pity more than a million people who were the nation's élite and constituted the momentum behind the Eastern Campaign and the Northern Expedition. So why should it be difficult for him to fabricate "crimes"? Is there any necessity to talk of "conscience"? The Chinese Communists know that in slaughterings it is necessary to change all merits of the victims into crimes. This is, of course, the proper "logic" of "cruel intrigues." Chinese Communists have experienced innumerable and terrible misfortunes; they know those self-appointed representa-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives of "Benevolence, righteousness, superior conduct" and original morality as lord high executioners. The people know their hearts well. Where are the "benevolence, righteousness, and superior conduct"? It is more likely that their hearts are filled with greed and bestiality!

It is true that "the experiences of this period of revolution were too painful, the losses of the country were too heavy and the people's sacrifices were too terrible." But where is the repentance of the executioners?

Who launched the ten years' civil war? The Communists and the revolutionary workers and peasants were compelled to fight in self-defence. Should they not have done this? Is it true that the Governor has the right to burn houses while the people have no right to light a lamp? Is it necessary that Communists and revolutionaries should not take up arms in self-defence but should instead be willingly cheated, arrested, tortured and killed like lambs?

To help the peasants obtain the land and develop their own production was what we Communists did during the agrarian revolution. This constituted our "unpardonable crime of rebellion." But was it really a crime? Were we criminal when we sought prosperity for the peasantry, which constitutes more than eighty per cent. of the whole population?

Who is responsible for flooding Chinese territory with blood, as the army marched forward destroying our peaceful villages? Please refer to the figures given in your official reports during the ten years' civil war. You killed hundreds and thousands of "bandits" here one day and killed hundreds of thousands of "bandits" there another day. The so-called "bandits" were none other than peaceful peasants in our peaceful villages. Towns and villages were burnt by the so-called "Bandit-suppression Army." Cannon, airplanes and machine-guns supplied by foreign countries were concentrated to bomb our peaceful villages. They were glad to burn down even the rice and wheat in the fields of our peaceful peasants. This is "honesty"! This is "benevolence, righteousness and morality"!

With fortitude and pain the Chinese Communists have fought together with the people, led the Red Army, broke through "Punitive Encirclements" and succeeded in preserving the best representatives of the Chinese people. They have forged an army with experience in thousands of engagements, able to resist more than half the Japanese troops in China and defend half of China's territories. If there were no Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies which were forged by the Communist Party and which are fighting against the enemy troops in such great numbers, could the Kuomintang withstand the enemy attack independently? If the troops of the Kuomintang could not stand independently, then is it not possible that the enemy might already have driven straight into Chungking, Kumming, Sian and Lanchow? Then how could China have survived until now? How could China be counted as one of the four big powers? And how could the authoritative gentlemen of the Kuomintang still sit safely and snugly in Chungking?

Mr. Chiang says:—

> If there were no Three People's Principles, there would also be no resistance; if there were no Chinese Kuomintang, there would also be no revolution.

But in fact, the contrary is true. If there had been no Chinese Communist Party, the Three People's Principles would have had no new content (first of all, the principle of anti-imperialism, and of the abolition of unequal treaties in the Principle of Nationalism); if there had been no

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chinese Communist Party, the great revolution would not have arrived. This is also true for the Kuomintang of today. If there had been no Chinese Communist Party not only would the situation of the Great Revolution be unimaginable, but also the mighty war of resistance of the last six years. The Chinese Communist Party was born to fight for the well-being of the nation and the people, and to help everyone to work in the interests of the people. We do not intend to praise ourselves constantly, but the wolf-hearted reactionaries in the Kuomintang not only try to tread on the Communists after having used them, but also spread scandalous rumours against them. So long as a Communist still has a mouth to speak, it is necessary for him to denounce these counter-revolutionary libels.

That the Chinese Communists are loyal to their country is plain to all the world. Before the Sian Incident* they repeatedly urged the Kuomintang to stop the internecine fighting, and to initiate a resistance through unity. Judging the Communists from its own selfish viewpoint, the Kuomintang thought the Communists were compelled to do this because they had come to a dead end. Nevertheless, when the Sian Incident broke out, the Chinese Communist Party not only did not take the opportunity for "looting during a fire," but, instead, for the consolidation of the nation, forgot the bitter enmity of the purging movement and the ten years' civil war and resolutely insisted on the release of Mr. Chiang. This brought about his release; yet he still tries to destroy the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies. To return evil for good has always been the philosophy of the big capitalists of China.

The Marco Polo Bridge Incident* occurred, the war of resistance broke out, and the Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies went immediately to the front, penetrating deeply into the occupied territories behind the enemy's lines with results known to the whole world. But what has been the attitude of the Kuomintang towards them? Not only does it block the war news of the two armies, but it also arrests the Communists on a large scale, rebukes them, attacks them, and kills them. Large numbers of secret service men conspire to penetrate into the Communist Party, attack it from the inside and outside so as completely to "destroy" it. Even in the occupied areas behind the lines, the troops led bythe Kuomintang members have not attacked the Japanese troops but instead have attacked the Eighth Route and the new Fourth Armies. Since these two armies were really attacking the Japanese troops, they were subjected to blows by both the enemy and the Kuomintang troops. However, these are not called "dextreous tricks" or "cruel intrigues," "self-interest and selfishness," but rather "utmost justice," "utmost honesty" and "utmost unselfishness"!

All the things mentioned above, we have "endured for the nation." We have mentioned them neither in speeches nor in written words. However, the author of *China's Destiny* centres his attacks upon the Chinese Communist Party; and recently the Kuomintang published the news of the demand for "disbanding the Chinese Communist Party" and "abolishing the Border Regions" through the official Central News Agency, and meanwhile has been preparing forces to invade the Border Regions. If, after all this, we still kept silence, we would

* The kidnapping of Chiang Kai-shek by officers of the Northern armies in December, 1926.

* The outrage by the Japanese military at Pekin (now Pei-ping) in July, 1937.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feel sorry not only for all the Communists who have sacrificed themselves, but also for all our fellow countrymen, for the Chinese nation and for our twenty-two years of party history.

Book Reviews

Debate on Africa

Race and Politics in Kenya by Elspeth Huxley and Margery Perham (Faber, 12*s* 6*d*).

MRS. HUXLEY may be labelled a Tory imperialist and Miss Perham a Liberal imperialist. The one approves of the settlement of white landowners in Africa, the other does not. This series of letters exchanged between them is instructive, because many of the consequences and possibilities of a policy of white settlement are set out in detail both from the "pro" and from the "anti" side. The reader will learn much about social and political conditions in East Africa as he goes along.

The ladies quarrel so vivaciously over such a multitude of matters that they almost give the impression of representing fundamentally opposed points of view. Actually, however, their agreements are more important than their differences. For both are at one in believing (in Miss Perham's words) "that Africans are not yet ready to play their parts as full citizens of a democratic State." Both hold that discrimination as between white and black in the ownership and use of land should remain. And, although the book purports to work over the recent history of Kenya with a fine tooth-comb, both writers have a tacit understanding not to mention the most discreditable of all features of British policy—I mean the Kakamega gold ramp of 1932.*

Apart from its direct interest as a description of the East African scene, the book deserves attention from Socialists as indicating the current state of mind of the imperialist intelligentsia (if such a phrase may be allowed). A study of this state of mind is one factor in the prediction of ruling class behaviour, and its results will have relevance to a far wider field of action than that of colonial affairs.

From this standpoint certain salient points come into relief.

(1) Confronted by modern social problems, even the very small-scale ones, that Kenya has to show, the imperialist mind loses the power of constructive thinking. Its efforts are directed to piecemeal adjustments of local tensions as and when they arise. The thought is fussy thought, all on the plane of tactics unshaped by any strategical conception.

(2) Absent also is any idea of an organic connection between Kenya's problems and those of the world economy as a whole.

(3) In the sphere of political and social organisation the imperialists can only divide. New forms of unification seem to be beyond them, not merely in practice, but even in idea. For example, both these authoresses favour territorial partition as a means of solving the racial problem in Kenya (compare Ireland, Palestine, India). They want to divide the colony into two areas, one for occupation by Europeans plus their African servants, the other as a parking-place for such Africans as are not needed or suited for employment by Europeans.

(4) Both writers are highly knowledgeable about African problems, yet both lack the gift of seeing them from an African point of view. It is well known that Mrs. Huxley and Miss Perham both have many African friends. But if it were not well known, it would be hard to believe on the evidence of this book. There is nothing here to suggest that either lady has ever had ten minutes' conversation with an African on equal terms. Neither thinks of African energy and African initiative as having any effective contribution to make *now*. In ten, twenty, thirty years' time—possibly. Now, no. For

*In 1930 a Native Lands Trust Ordinance was passed which reserved certain specified areas "for the benefit of the native tribes *for ever*." Within a year or so gold was discovered at Kakamega in the Kavirondo reserve. The Kenya Government thereupon passed in 1932 an amending ordinance excluding the gold-bearing land from the reserve, without providing equivalent land elsewhere for the use of the tribe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both ladies, "sympathetic" as they are, the African people are a backward race, a child race, to be laughed at or wept over, to be helped and prodded, steered and curbed, but not enrollable as friends and fellow-workers in a common cause with ourselves—the cause of democracy.

The effect of all these mental blinkers is to make the discussion between Mrs. Huxley and Miss Perham largely unreal. The suggestion the disputants leave in the mind of the reader is that the problem of the political and economic relations between white and black is insoluble in Kenya conditions. Actually it admits of a straightforward solution either on an imperialist or on a Communist basis.

On the former, the white settler group could be bought out and repatriated to Europe on a generous compensation formula for some £8 millions. The scale of the problem is as small as that: some 1,700 landowners and less than 10,000 square miles of land are involved. After all, £8 millions is not a large sum to people who (through Mr. R. S. Hudson) were in 1939 offering £1,000 millions for the development and welfare of Nazi Germany, and who in 1940 actually paid £90 millions to the Turks to keep out of the war.

As for a Communist basis, I do not suggest that that is practical politics in Kenya at the moment. But in view of what has happened in Soviet Central Asia in the last twenty years, it could have been very relevantly discussed in a book of this kind. In point of fact, Soviet experience receives only a couple of perfunctory mentions. The astonishing social achievement by which the colour bar has been exterminated root and branch, throughout the whole of Soviet territory, and in its place a racial equality has been built up which is not a mere name or a mere legal form but a vigorous and fruitful creative partnership—this entire record has failed to arouse even a languid interest in our two authoresses.

LEONARD BARNES.

Planning for India

A Plan of Economic Development for India by Sir P. Thakurdas and others (Penguin Special, 9*d*).

Our Economic Problem by P. A. Wadia and K. T. Merchant (New Book Company, Bombay, *Rs*6.8).

THE PUBLICATION in Britain and India of the Bombay Plan for Indian economic development is an important sign of the times. The Plan has been drawn up by eight leading Indian industrialists, including four directors of the Tata Combine and three directors of the Reserve Bank of India. They set out detailed proposals for a Fifteen Year Plan to treble the national income, double the income per head, increase industrial production five times and agricultural production by 130 per cent., and establish a universal national education and health service. They make clear that they regard as an indispensable political assumption the establishment of a National Government with full powers in economic matters and legislating for the whole of India. A delegation of Indian industrialists will be visiting Britain and the United States with a view to exploring the necessary basis of support and co-operation for large-scale economic development in India.

It is of undoubted positive value that a plan of this nature should appear at the present time. The plan is, of course, a plan of Indian Big Capital, but of Indian Big Capital striving for Indian independence from foreign control and for the maximum development of Indian productive resources, and thus fulfilling a progressive role and to this extent coinciding with the national interests of the Indian people. Irrespective of necessary criticism on particular weaknesses of the plan, the outstanding positive value of this Memorandum as a basis of discussion lies in the following features:—

(1) It represents a bold and far-reaching scheme of economic and social development, and will help to encourage a bold approach on the part of public opinion in India and in Britain, and a recognition of the vast possibilities of developing India's productive resources on a large scale.

(2) It sets the definite aim of rapidly overcoming poverty and backwardness by such large-scale development of Indian productive resources, with special emphasis on the development of power resources and basic industry.

(3) It sets out concrete proposals, and at any rate, rough provisional estimates in terms of figures (by no means so vague or unconsidered as some critics

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here have suggested), for fulfilling these aims.

(4) It recognises the necessity of a National Government with adequate powers as the indispensable means for carrying out such a plan, and thus takes a definite political alignment, avoiding the common pitfall of economic planning in a vacuum of political neutrality.

The main weaknesses spring inevitably from the big industrialist source of this plan. These weaknesses are especially marked in the following respects:—

(1) Agricultural development. The proposals for tackling this crucial problem of Indian economy are wholly inadequate. Irrigation, soil conservation, consolidation of holdings and co-operative societies to assist in paying off rural debt can barely touch the fringes of the problem, so long as there is no attempt to tackle the basic issues of land tenure and land ownership. Although it is obvious that it will require a very large-scale capital expenditure and far-reaching reorganisation to raise the technical level and productivity of Indian agriculture, the plan allocates £930 million for agricultural development, as against £3,360 million for industry. The proposals would leave the problems of the mass of the poorest peasantry, and those who have lost their land, unsolved.

(2) The question of the market corresponding to the contemplated increase of production. This is bound up with the preceding question of agricultural development and the problem of the poor peasantry. The plan endeavours to separate the question of distribution from production, holding over distribution for a subsequent report.

(3) The role of the State in industry and the economic field is similarly held over. Yet the fulfilment of a plan of national development will require the State to fulfil a very considerable role in respect of ownership, control, direction of investment; and it is doubtful if any effective plan can be carried through without State ownership in the key industries.

(4) Finance. The plan proposes to raise £2,550 million of "created money," with the consequent danger of inflation throwing the severest burdens on the poorest, while there are no proposals for a more effective system of taxing wealth.

(5) The question of co-operation of the people as the indispensable basis for the success of the plan. A paragraph under this heading deals only with the training of technicians and managers. No attention is given to the necessity of democratic initiative and co-operation of the people themselves through their organisations, peasants' organisations, workers in industry, Trade Unions, etc., if the whole plan is not to be sunk in a bureaucratic quagmire breeding fascist dangers.

The Bombay Plan, while a valuable contribution to stimulate discussion, should not be regarded as the plan of the Indian national movement, still in process of preparation by the National Planning Commission of the Congress, set up, under the chairmanship of Nehru, shortly before the war, and which, it may be hoped, will shortly be able to resume its labours under more favourable conditions.

A parallel indication of the increasing concern of Indian discussion with current economic problems for progressive development is afforded by the appearance of *Our Economic Problem*, a volume of 536 pages, by two Indian university professors, published last year in Bombay. This is a useful and industrious collection of information and statistics covering most of the fields of Indian economy (sometimes from derivative sources, not always acknowledged), but with mediocre insight into the problems. The outlook is vaguely national in sympathy, in general academically neutral, and ending with a religious conclusion. Nevertheless, useful for reference as a collection of materials.

R. P. D.

Correspondence

(On points arising from the article in "The Co-operative Century" by Tom Vernon, in our July issue, we print the following from a correspondent in West Africa.)

Most people will agree, as even the Colonial Secretary does, that there are great hopes that Co-operation will bring both economic progress and political experience to the people of the colonies (Leonard Barnes in his *Soviet Light on*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Colonies is, to a socialist, completely convincing on this point); but some may say "The C.W.S. has more important things nearer home to busy itself with for long years after the war, before any overseas enterprises can be tackled."

The point is, however, that the C.W.S. already has its overseas interests. In Nigeria, the colony where I work as an official and of which I have personal experience, the C.W.S. purchases palm oil and palm kernels and (since the war) cocoa to supply her margarine, soap and chocolate factories in the U.K. The C.W.S., however, has no colonial policy as such, except to buy at the cheapest possible competitive rate and in the simplest possible manner. In other words, C.W.S. agents buy at the prices dictated by the effects of world demand on the purchasing policy of the private firms who compete with C.W.S. in the market (in peace time the prices fluctuate enormously to the occasional benefit of the speculating middleman and to the steady disadvantage of the producer) and by means of African middlemen. These middlemen are the African capitalists of the future and have a very powerful hold over the peasant producers—a hold gained by unscrupulous exploitation of their poverty and illiteracy and resulting in indebtedness with regard to next year's crop or even the crop of the year after next.

Incidentally, there are co-operative marketing societies, but they are few and, in spite of (and partly because of) Government support, weak. The middlemen have two trump cards to play to get an infant co-operative down—the indebtedness to themselves of the would-be members and the widespread suspicion of the white man and the Government. The Government Co-operative Department is understaffed and generally feeble (the big firms would pull big strings if there was any real danger to their interests in the growth of co-operation) and confines its activities to supervising and encouraging cocoa-marketing societies, etc.

But, as far as I am aware, the C.W.S. has shown no interest even in the Government's tentative efforts at developing co-operation. To the African farmer, the C.W.S. means nothing. If he is even aware of the firm's existence, he believes it to be exactly similar to the other private trading firms. The only difference is that the other firms import goods as well as exporting produce, the C.W.S. only exports; and this handicaps the C.W.S. in dealing with middlemen, who like to buy imports on credit from the firm for whom they buy produce.

In view of all these facts the British co-operative movement should at least take cognizance of the problem and formulate some sort of colonial policy.

My own suggestions are :—

(i) "*Co-operative Missionaries.*" What are wanted are exceptional men, ready to mix on something near equal terms with Africans, ready to learn about the country and the people (and even the languages) and about the problems of the producer, imbued with the principles of co-operation and imaginative enough to apply those principles to a new set of circumstances, ready to live simply (even though paid high salaries, as they would deserve to be paid) and to try to win the confidence and friendship of John African. If such men exist, they could achieve tremendous things in Africa. After some years they should be able to help the C.W.S. at home to formulate a policy which will transform the economy of the colonies.

(ii) *Extension of activities.* Obviously this must wait upon more essential consolidation nearer home. A start might be made with imports, through the distribution of which consumers' co-operation in Africa might be initiated. The sort of imported articles in demand are salt, flour, sugar, cloth of all kinds, cigarettes, kerosene, matches, corrugated iron, hardware, bicycles, gunpowder (for hunters), ropes and twine (for fishermen), footwear. As well as palm products, cocoa, groundnuts and hides, there are numerous other export goods such as rubber, ginger, fruit, cotton, coffee and tobacco. In due course industries might be started in the colonies, especially in the terribly overcrowded Eastern Provinces. Elsewhere a start could be made with co-operative processing (e.g., oil extraction of palm produce). Road and water transport (largely controlled by middlemen and the big firms at present) is another eventual sphere of co-operation. Collective farms may be a visionary ideal, but co-operative marketing and a co-operators' agricultural bank should be high on the pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gramme. The C.W.S., if it is to compete successfully with the big firms, will have to engage in shipping sooner or later. In everything solidarity between the peoples of the dependent Empire and of Britain can be enormously increased by a determination to treat colonial co-operators as real partners and give them an ever-increasing share in the administration of C.W.S. enterprises.

GUARANTEE FUND (*Continued from page ii. of cover*)

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
L'Humanite		2	0	Anon, Whitchurch ...		14	0	J. Rattray		5	0
F. Overington ...		3	0	R. Serjeant		5	0	W. Lakin-Smith ...		2	6
A. Wall		5	0	T. Z.		2	0	H. E. C.	1	0	0
K.M.G., Ex-Rhodesia		2	6	E. Reckitt	5	0	0	G. E. and M. Philibert		10	0
T. W. R.	1	0	0	F. Stehr		5	0	Socialist Sailor ...	2	10	0
A. C. O.		6	0	H. Wimborne ...		5	0	G. Morey		5	0
S. Mill		10	0	E. Fidler	1	0	0	H. S. M.		2	6
E. S. Stiff		2	6	Anon		3	0	L'Humanite		2	0
F. Renouf		2	6	A. Walker		14	0	Learner		2	0
Old Age Pensioner ...		1	6	E. Ashworth		5	0	G. Harrison	1	0	0
D. Parvin		5	0	D. Rees		10	0	E. Saunders		3	0
Mrs. Collins		2	0	Edinburgh D.G. ...		12	6	N. Mackenzie ...		13	0
R. Stevenson ...		5	0	H. Cumming		13	0	H. Braybrook ...		10	0
D.29		2	6	Druzya Uchitellya ...		10	0	K. Harding		2	0
N. Libovitch ...		5	0	R. Barrett		5	0	E. McCallum ...		5	0
R. Brown		3	0	E. Fischer		2	0	Salud		5	0
C. Bennett		3	0	P. Andrews	1	0	0	R. Rees		10	0
J. Dunsby		10	0	Anon, Oxford ...	1	0	0	F. Goodhead ...		10	0
A. Bruce		3	0	C. Meredith	3	0	0	Smoke		10	0
J. Turner		4	0	N. Kelly		6	6	R. F. B. ...	3	0	0
T. C.	5	0	0	I. Martin		5	0	J. Roberts	3	0	0
J. Trott		3	0	A. Edwards		10	0	R. Oliver		1	0
J. Macdonald ...		5	0	H. Smith	3	10	0	J. Macdonald ...		5	0
D. Gay		3	0	F. Farrington ...		7	0	Radio Mech.,R.E.M.E.		10	0
R. Carpenter ...		10	0	J. Seyd		13	0	Eight of the Boys ...		10	0
G. Robson		5	0	D. Halpern		15	0	R. Pearson		2	6
M. Dunne		3	0	A. Heys		2	6	R. Anderson		7	6
J. Burnip		5	0	Polly		10	0	E. S. Stiff		2	6
R. Mecredy		10	0	R. Green		3	0	F. M. R.		10	0
C. McNally		6	0	Eric and Norah ...		10	0	F. Fenton		1	6
N. Miall		3	0	A. Ford		5	0	J. Davenport ...		13	0
R. Sleep		2	6	E. Thompson ...		13	0	D.29		2	6
Sgt. R.A.S.C., W.A.F.		5	0	R. Hodgart		3	0	R.M.O., R.E.M.E. ...		10	6
C. W. G.		5	0	A. and B. Muskett ...	1	0	0	Symphony Orchestra	2	7	0
E. Stout		5	0	R. Morris		10	0	F. Newman		3	0
C. M. F.	1	15	0	J. Nicholson		2	6	W. Harries		10	0
W. Burbridge ...		2	6	R. N. Millar		5	0	L. Martin		3	0
Lower Morden D.G.		2	6	Anon, Whitchurch ...		1	0	Forces, per D.A.H. ...	1	0	0
P. Pearman		2	6	G. K.		7	0	Director	2	0	0
J. Atkinson		5	0	M. Darby		3	0	Socialist Sailor ...	2	10	0

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 *months* 7*s. Postage paid. Abroad,* 8*s. Two weeks' notice is required for change of address.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DISCUSSION GROUPS

With the nearer prospect of the end of the war brought by the decisive advances on all fronts, the peoples of all countries are turning their minds to post-war problems. This opens up a new field of activity for the existing LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Groups and a need to form new groups in each locality.

It is of great importance that representatives of varying trends of opinion and organisations, as well as those who are seeking their way, should find a common ground on which to meet and thrash out their problems. The LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Groups provide an opportunity for this—which should be seized.

To assist in this the LABOUR MONTHLY has prepared a short outline of suggestions on the discussion of post-war problems, which will be sent on application.

Will group conveners and readers generally send in their views on this proposed new activity and on the possibility of forming new groups and extending existing groups ?

The stencilled Guide (3s. a year, post free) will also handle these questions currently as they come up.

100 YEARS

of Rochdale Co-operation

JOSEPH REEVES

The long-awaited history of the Co-operative Movement, with a discussion of the problems facing it today. Ready shortly.

About 5/-

LAWRENCE & WISHART Ltd

2 Southampton Place, W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PROQUEST REPRINTS
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED